

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed August 10, 2004, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this Application, Applicants submit the following remarks, have canceled claims and have added new claims. The claims as now presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1-21 were pending in this Application. By this Amendment, claim 18 has been canceled. Applicants expressly reserve the right to prosecute the canceled claim and similar claims in one or more related Applications. Claims 22-30 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-17 and 19-30 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 9 and 19 are independent claims.

Objection to the Drawings

The Drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In particular, the Office Action on page 2, paragraph 1 contends that the DC transformer feature is not shown in the Drawings.

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with this contention, Applicants have made a correction to Fig. 1 of the Drawings and a corresponding correction to the Specification in order to further the prosecution of the Application. A Replacement Sheet is enclosed with reference numeral 39 shown to generally refer to a DC transformer of the cable assembly 24. No new matter has been added.

Nevertheless, Applicants wish to point out that the DC transformer feature is already properly supported by the Drawings and the Specification even without the corrections. For example, Applicants explain that the cable assembly 24 (see reference numeral 24 in Fig. 1) is capable of being a "brick on a rope" type power supply assembly (see page 6, line 19 and page 7, lines 19-20 of the Specification). Accordingly, the DC transformer was inherently shown already by way of reference numeral 24.

For the reasons stated above, the DC transformer feature is shown in the Drawings. Accordingly, the objection to the Drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) should be withdrawn.

Rejections under §103

Claims 1-7 and 9-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,989,052 (Fields et al.). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields et al. in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (APA).

In connection with claims 1-17, Applicants respectfully traverse the §103(a) rejections and request reconsideration. In connection with claims 19-21, Applicants have amended the claims, and these claims patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. All of the claims are now in allowable condition.

Fields discloses a safety cover apparatus 100 having a rectangular cover plate 200 with slots 220, and caps 300 with resilient legs 324 (column 3, lines 13-65 and Figs. 1-4). Each cap 300 presents a pair of oppositely disposed slots 320 therein with the resilient legs 324 attached to an upper end 322 of each slot 320 (column 3, lines 53-56). Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5a and 5b of Fields show the cap 300 having an overall tapered shape with the legs 324 mirroring that tapered shape. To install a cap 300, each slot 220 of the plate 200 receives an end of a leg 324 while the leg 324 is in a normal, non-depressed position (column 4, lines 1-5). Then, each leg 324 must be depressed into its slot 320 upon clockwise rotation of the cap 300 (column 4, lines 9-12). Accordingly, the apparatus 100 protects young children from receiving electrical shocks caused by direct or indirect interaction with an electrical outlet, and prevent unintentional disengagement of an electrical plug from an electrical outlet or from another plug (column 5, lines 41-46).

Applicants Admitted Prior Art discloses that a typical network router includes a power supply (page 1, lines 6-7 of the Specification). Some network

router manufacturers provide network routers with "brick on a rope" type external power supply assemblies (page 2, lines 7-12 of the Specification).

### Claims 1-8

Claim 1 is directed to a connection system which includes a device, and a cable assembly having a cable and a cable connector disposed at an end of the cable. The cable connector is configured to connect to the device. The connection system further includes a retaining clip configured to secure the cable connector to the device when the cable connector connects to the device. The retaining clip includes a main body defining a cavity and a central axis which extends through the cavity. The main body is configured to receive and hold the cable connector. The retaining clip further includes a set of latching arms attached to the main body. Each latching arm extends in a direction substantially parallel to the central axis and being configured to latch the main body to the device when the main body receives and holds the cable connector and when the cable connector connects to the device.

The cited prior art does not teach or suggest a connection system which includes a retaining clip having a set of latching arms attached to a main body, each latching arm extending in a direction substantially parallel to a central axis of the main body and being configured to latch the main body to a device when the main body receives and holds a cable connector and when the cable connector connects to the device, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Fields discloses a safety cover apparatus 100 having a cap 300 in which each leg 324 must be depressed into its slot 320 upon clockwise rotation of the cap 300 for installation (see column 4, lines 9-12 of Fields).

The Office Action states on page 3, paragraph 4 that Fields does not disclose each latching arm extending in a direction substantially parallel to a central axis and being configured to latch a main body to a device when the main body receives and holds a cable connector and when the cable connector connects to the device. Applicants agree. In particular, in contrast to the

retaining clip recited in claim 1, Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5a and 5b of Fields show the Fields cap 300 having an overall tapered shape with the legs 324 mirroring that tapered shape.

However, the Office Action then contends that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form each latching arm extending in a direction substantially parallel to a central axis band being configured to latch the main body to the device. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cap 300 in Fields is designed to protect young children from receiving electrical shocks caused by direct or indirect interaction with an electrical outlet and thus has legs 324 which are consistent with the shape of the cap 300 (e.g., see column 5, lines 41-46 and Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5a and 5b of Fields). If one were to argue that the legs 324 of Fields were latching arms of claim 1, if anything, it seems that modifying the legs 324 of the Fields cap 300 to extend in a direction substantially parallel to a central axis would cause the legs 324 to pass through the inner part of the Fields cap 300 through the slots 320. However, that seems impossible since the inner part of the Fields cap 300 would hold a plug. Alternatively, one could push the attachment points of the legs 324 outward but this would be contrary to Fields explanation of the legs 324 attaching to an upper end 322 of each slot 320 (e.g., see column 3, lines 53-56 of Fields) and the Fields cap 300 would no longer have a tapered shape and thus perhaps be less safe to protect young children.

As the basis for this contention, the Office Action at the bottom of page 3 and top of page 4 argues that this would involve only a minor change in shape producing no specific new result and also it has been held that the provision of adjustability where needed, involves only routine skill in the art, In re Stevens, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954). As just explained, this is not the case. There would not be a minor change. Rather, the change would cause the legs 324 to pass through the slots 320 and into the inner portion of the Fields cap 300, or require the Fields cap 300 to lose its tapered shape.

Moreover, contrary to the contention made by the Office Action that the substantially parallel feature does not produce a specific new result, a specific new result of the substantially parallel feature of claim 1 is that it allows the retaining clip to employ support rails 94 to provide sturdy and well-controlled actuation of the retaining clip by inhibiting twisting, torquing and/or movement of the various retaining clip portions in undesired directions. This feature is explained in the Specification, for example, on page 11, lines 6-10.

For the reasons stated above, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 1 is in allowable condition.

Because claims 2-8 depend from and further limit claim 1, claims 2-8 are in allowable condition for at least the same reasons.

#### Claims 9-17

Claim 9 is directed to a retaining clip for securing a cable connector to a device when the cable connector connects to the device. The retaining clip includes a main body defining a cavity and a central axis which extends through the cavity. The main body is configured to receive and hold the cable connector. The retaining clip further includes a set of latching arms attached to the main body. Each latching arm extends in a direction substantially parallel to the central axis and is configured to latch the main body to the device when the main body receives and holds the cable connector and when the cable connector connects to the device.

The prior art does not teach or suggest a retaining clip having a set of latching arms attached to a main body, each latching arm extending in a direction substantially parallel to a central axis of the main body and being configured to latch the main body to a device when the main body receives and holds a cable connector and when the cable connector connects to the device, as recited in claim 9. Rather, as explained above in connection with claim 1, Fields discloses a cap 300 in which each leg 324 must be depressed into its slot 320 upon

clockwise rotation of the cap 300 for installation (see column 4, lines 9-12 of Fields), and modifying the Fields cap 300 is clearly non-obvious.

Accordingly, claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Thus, the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn, and claim 9 is in allowable condition.

Because claims 10-17 depend from and further limit claim 9, claims 10-17 are in allowable condition for at least the same reasons.

#### Claims 19-21

Claim 19 is directed to a method for using a retaining clip which is adapted to secure a cable connector to a device. The method includes capturing the cable connector within a cavity defined by a main body of a retaining clip, connecting the cable connector to the device, and inserting a set of latching arms of the retaining clip through a set of holes defined in the device to latch the main body to the device. The set of latching arms is attached to a main body of the retaining clip. Each latching arm extends in a direction substantially parallel to a central axis defined by the main body and being configured to latch the main body to the device when the main body receives and holds the cable connector and when the cable connector connects to the device.

The cited prior art does not teach or suggest a method for using a retaining clip which is adapted to secure a cable connector to a device where the retaining clip includes a set of latching arms is attached to a main body of the retaining clip, each latching arm extending in a direction substantially parallel to a central axis defined by the main body and being configured to latch the main body to the device when the main body receives and holds the cable connector and when the cable connector connects to the device, as recited in claim 19. Rather, as explained above in connection with claim 1, Fields discloses a cap 300 in which each leg 324 must be depressed into its slot 320 upon clockwise rotation of the cap 300 for installation (see column 4, lines 9-12 of Fields), and modifying the Fields cap 300 is clearly non-obvious.

Accordingly, claim 19 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn, and claim 19 is in allowable condition.

Because claims 20-21 depend from and further limit claim 19, claims 20-21 are in allowable condition for at least the same reasons.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 22-30 have been added and are believed to be in allowable condition. Claims 22-24 depend from claim 1. Claims 25-27 depend from claim 9. Claims 28-30 depend from claim 19. Support for claims 22-23, 25-26 and 28-29 is provided within the Specification, for example, on page 10 , line 3 through page 11, line 10. Support for claims 24, 27 and 30 is provided within the Specification, for example, on page 11 , line 23 through page 12, line 16. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, this Application should be in condition for allowance. A Notice to this affect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this Amendment, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' Representative at the number below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this Amendment, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0901.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 366-9600, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,



David E. Huang, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No.: 39,229  
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581  
Telephone: (508) 366-9600  
Facsimile: (508) 616-9805

Attorney Docket No.: CIS03-49(7843)

Dated: November 10, 2004